



FILED
7-16-14
03:53 PM

CAP/ar9/ek4 7/16/2014

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider
Alternative-Fueled Vehicle Programs,
Tariffs, and Policies.

Rulemaking 13-11-007
(Filed November 14, 2013)

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

1. Summary

Pursuant to Rule 7.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules),¹ this Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Ruling) sets forth the schedule, assigns the presiding officer, addresses the scope of this proceeding and resolves other procedural matters following the prehearing conference (PHC) held on February 26, 2014. This ruling also confirms that this is a quasi-legislative proceeding, for which hearings are not necessary. The schedule set below provides for three Phases within the same proceeding but, in any event, anticipates a final Commission decision by the end of 2015. Phase 1 is initiated with an opportunity for the Respondent utilities and the Parties to provide comments on proposed Guiding Principles and a set of questions regarding issues with current Commission Alternative Fueled Vehicle (AFV) program activities. Based on the schedule set forth below, this proceeding is expected to resolve within 18 months of the date of this Scoping Ruling, consistent with Pub.

¹ All references to Rules are to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. These rules are available on the Commission's website at http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/WORD_PDF/AGENDA_DECISION/143256.PDF

Util. Code § 1701.5(b). This ruling is appealable only as to category of this proceeding under procedures in Rule 7.6. This ruling also allows for claims for intervenor compensation to be filed at the conclusion of each phase rather than at the end of the proceeding.

2. Background

On November 22, 2013, the Commission opened this Rulemaking to broadly consider all issues related to alternative-fueled vehicles (AFV) adoption. With this scope in mind, the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) preliminarily set forth two initial policy-focused tracks. The first track would evaluate the potential and value of vehicle-grid integration (VGI), including the use of vehicle batteries for demand response and energy storage. The second track would focus on the development of new AFV tariffs in each of the three largest investor-owned utility (IOU) service territories. The OIR also indicated that both tracks will be informed by Commission consideration of financing strategies.

In addition, the OIR stated that the proceeding will address outstanding issues from the previous AFV Rulemaking (R.) 09-08-009, including development and deployment of a submetering protocol and cost allocation related to distribution system upgrades under Electric Rules 15 and 16.

Respondents were directed and interested persons were invited to file comments on the OIR. On December 13, 2013, 23 parties filed opening comments on the OIR,² and on December 20, 2013, 12 parties filed reply comments.³

² Opening comments were filed by: California Independent System Operator (CAISO), CALSTART, California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE), California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA), ChargePoint, Clean Coalition, Clean Energy Fuels (CEF), EV Grid, General Motors (GM), Green Power Institute and Community Environmental Council (GPI/CEC), Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC), Marin Clean Energy (MCE), National Electrical Manufacturer's Association (NEMA), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), NRG

Footnote continued on next page

The OIR also scheduled the first workshop that was held on December 4, 2013. The workshop discussed two issues: (i) Energy Division's (ED's) Staff White Paper on Vehicle Grid Integration (ED White Paper), included in the OIR as Appendix A, and; (ii) financing proposals to reduce vehicle and infrastructure costs. ED staff developed a workshop summary report (Report) and on February 5, 2014, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling seeking stakeholder comment on the Report in addition to three follow-up questions regarding the ED White Paper. On February 9, 2014, 13 parties filed comments in response to the ruling.⁴

A PHC was held on February 26, 2014. At the PHC, parties discussed the ALJ's proposed proceeding structure, as detailed below in Table 1.

Energy (NRG), Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E), Proterra, Southern California Edison (SCE), San Diego Gas and Electric Co. (SDG&E), Southern California Gas Co. (SoCalGas), TURN, and Vote Solar Initiative (VSI).

³ Reply comments were filed by: CCSE, CESA, ChargePoint, GM, GPI/CEC, NRDC, NRG, ORA, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and SoCalGas.

⁴ Opening comments were filed by: CAISO, CESA, Chargepoint, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), GPI/CEC, NRDC, ORA, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, Shell Energy North America (Shell), SoCalGas, and VSI.

Table 1. Proposed Proceeding Structure

Phase 1: Policy Matters	Phase 2: Policy Matters	Phase 3: Ratesetting Matters (may require separate applications or advice letters)
VGI ⁵ Guiding Principles VGI Use Cases 1, 2 & 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ED workshop(s) • ALJ/ AC ruling and party comments Rates policy for transit and commercial charging segments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALJ/ AC ruling and party comments 	VGI Use Case 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ED workshop(s) • ALJ/ AC ruling and party comments Proposals to address EVSE ⁶ infrastructure and PEV ⁷ purchase barriers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALJ/ AC ruling and party comments 	Tariffs/pilots for VGI Use Cases 1, 2 & 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearings may be required Tariffs to address rate issues for priority sectors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearings may be required Tariffs/pilots addressing financing Tariffs/pilots for VGI Use Case 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearings may be required

As explained at the PHC, the proposed three-phase approach was developed in response to the parties' filed comments at that time, the priority of goals for this proceeding, and the interests in providing a workable and efficient approach for the rulemaking. The proposed structure diverged from the concurrent two-track approach in the original rulemaking in favor of a

⁵ Vehicle-Grid Integration (VGI).

⁶ Electric Vehicle Service Equipment (EVSE).

⁷ Plug-In Electric Vehicle (PEV).

three-phase proceeding that grouped related issues together and sequenced the phases so that the work of each phase would build upon the final decision in the prior phase.

3. Scope of Proceeding - Discussion

After hearing from the parties at the PHC, the issues raised will fall within the three phases of the ALJ's proposed proceeding structure as discussed below.

The scope is as follows:

3.1 Phase I – AFV Program Continuation and VGI Program Development

3.1.1 Guiding Principles

In comments to the OIR, parties raised a broad range of issues to be considered. Generally, the utilities recommended that the OIR focus on regulatory policy and utility initiatives that accelerate PEV adoption, increase the total zero emission miles driven, evaluate the role of utilities, and explore infrastructure development through simple, lowest cost, near-term activities. PG&E, for example, noted that from the research it has conducted, the major impediments to PEV adoption are: (1) the upfront cost of the PEV; (2) the range and associated amount of retail PEV charging infrastructure available; and (3) consumer knowledge and awareness of the benefits and costs of PEVs. SDG&E also advocated that the utilities should be allowed to actively participate in all aspects of transportation electrification, including owning and operating grid-integrated charging facilities.

TURN contended, however, that “supporting and facilitating” rapid commercialization of PEVs is different than causing such commercialization. In TURN's view, the purpose of this OIR should be to determine the most efficient way for utilities to be prepared for and to facilitate the electric vehicle commercialization that the State intends to promote. According to TURN, the

utilities do not have the primary responsibility for this commercialization, and it is not the responsibility of utility ratepayers to provide incentives to commercialize PEVs in California.

Finally, many parties, including the CAISO, Clean Coalition, GM, GPI, PG&E and SCE suggested that the Commission develop guiding principles to steer the activities in this proceeding, particularly as they relate to VGI.

Given the broad scope of this proceeding and the range of perspectives represented by parties, the Commission should develop and adopt guiding principles to direct and focus policy development for AFVs. The OIR established the goal of facilitating AFV adoption with the objective of decreasing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) being key, among others. The following guiding principles are proposed to apply to all the activities within scope of this proceeding:

- Promote the deployment of safe and reliable AFV grid infrastructure designed to meet transportation and energy service needs while maximizing ratepayer benefits and minimizing costs to all utility customers.
- Target near-term solutions that complement the use of preferred energy resources and utilize the grid efficiently.
- Incorporate and enhance policies from other, related Commission proceedings to promote efficient program implementation and use of ratepayer funding.
- Enable and incorporate the full range of values from VGI in a new program as part of the Commission's overall AFV efforts while remaining technology neutral and allowing for business model innovation.

Guiding Principles will be adopted in a Phase I Interim Decision to use as direction when considering policy, rules, regulations and tariff design throughout all phases of this proceeding, including all Phase 1 policy and program design activities. Parties will have an opportunity to comment on these

proposed Guiding Principles as part of the scheduled activities for Phase 1 described below.

**3.1.2 Current Program Issues:
Pilot Activities and Market
Acceleration Proposals**

It will be important to remain mindful of the many activities currently underway that relate to the questions examined in this proceeding. To that end, the utilities prepared and served a comprehensive Joint Statement of Related Proceedings on June 13, 2014.⁸ This document will be an important reference in developing and deciding further AFV policy and designing related pilot programs in this rulemaking. In particular, the Commission will explore in this Phase how to identify and capture later in this proceeding the best practices developed and lessons learned from the results of the AFV pilot programs currently underway.

In conjunction with consideration of ongoing pilot activities, parties raised a number of issues related to PEV market acceleration. These include issues related to financing for vehicles purchases, customer education and outreach and specific rate policies that are perceived as barriers to greater PEV adoption.

In regards to financing, the utilities and ratepayer advocates generally do not believe the Commission should direct the utilities to provide direct financing to customers. TURN specifically points to the financing of auto purchases which

⁸ On June 3, 2014, ALJ Moosen directed the respondent utilities to prepare and serve the Joint Statement of Related Proceedings, approved AFV pilot programs now in progress and any related compliance activities under way or anticipated as a result of recent decisions. The utilities were directed to include, at a minimum, a brief description of the issues under consideration in those proceedings which relate to this proceeding and the dates of any hearings scheduled and projected dates for proposed decisions.

they contend is an inappropriate area for electric utility activity. The utilities generally agree that the Commission should not require them to provide such services as direct financing, credit enhancements or acquisition incentives for electric vehicles. However, the utilities generally agree that they may have a role in reducing the total cost of electric vehicle ownership through infrastructure development, rate design or other programs strictly within existing utility service areas.

ORA offered a number of specific recommendations instead of direct vehicle financing including rates targeted to specific levels of charging, utility obligations to inform electric vehicle owners of TOU rate and metering options and to continue tracking electric vehicle related distribution infrastructure costs.

While this proceeding will not create a new ratepayer funding mechanism to replace existing state and federal incentives, some utility activities, such as VGI and supporting PEV grid infrastructure can provide value to customers. This value could be reflected in the upfront vehicle costs as well as other costs related to the ownership and operations of the PEV.

Issues related to VGI are discussed in Section 3.1.3 below. In regards to grid infrastructure, Phase 1 of this proceeding will include the issue of how the utilities can facilitate PEV infrastructure development. Pursuant to Decision (D.) 11-07-029, this will be considered in the context of underserved markets or market failure in areas where utility involvement is currently prohibited.⁹ Initially, comments should focus on whether these conditions may exist for

⁹ D. 11-07-029 at 50.

non-public charging at multi-unit dwellings¹⁰ and workplace market segments. Phase 1 will take comment on the role utilities may take in preparing facilities for PEV service equipment installation – often referred to as “make-ready stub” installation – as well as other proposals for how the utility may better serve these market segments.

In regards to customer education and outreach, the utilities are currently authorized by D.11-07-029 to provide information to customers on the availability, cost, and environmental impacts of electric vehicles as well as the available metering options, rate plans, and charging options before they make their service selections. D.11-07-029 also adopted guidelines to define the scope of the utilities’ role in education and outreach.

In the instant proceeding, ORA and others commented on the need for better information and education dissemination by the utilities. Phase 1 will take comment on near-term, low cost solutions to accelerate the electric vehicle market including the education and outreach needs to support further electric vehicle adoption. It will be important to hear whether existing resources are available for education and outreach activities and what additional resources may be needed.

Finally, regarding rate policy, several parties indicated that demand charges are a barrier for PEV adoption in particular market segments. Additional policy refinement may be needed to ensure that demand charges are not prohibitive for utility customers pursuing transportation electrification. Transit fleet operators, in particular, may need special consideration. This

¹⁰ Multi-unit dwellings with submetered tenants are served under utility commercial customer rates.

proceeding will allow for more input to determine whether to mitigate current demand charges levels and if so, how to do so.

3.1.3 VGI - Program Structure

The balance of Phase 1 will be largely devoted to developing foundational policy and a regulatory framework as the necessary first step in building and operationalizing a new Commission VGI program. This proceeding aims to enable customers, utilities and other stakeholders to capture grid resource and reliability benefits from vehicle-grid integration. Realizing this goal will require defining vehicle-grid integration use cases, testing their application through field deployments that engage diverse stakeholders, and implementing utility programs. Ultimately, full implementation will require that any application demonstrate its cost-effectiveness. Specific attention will be given to “managed” or “incentivized” charging as discussed below.

The ED White Paper provided a useful conceptual framework and resource for this proceeding’s work developing the VGI program. In addition to adopting a set of Guiding Principles, the first two Phases of this rulemaking will examine how to integrate VGI initiatives with existing utility programs, such as, resource procurement and renewable resource programs. One of the challenges in this proceeding will be the coordination with the on-going AFV proposals in other proceedings, pilot activities currently underway and the need to capture the experience and recorded results from these pilots.

In order to maximize the effectiveness of the VGI demonstrations, Phase 1 will consider how VGI resources should be valued as well as identifying the costs and benefits associated with VGI applications. Rather than develop an evaluation criteria from scratch, Phase 1 will look to existing Commission methodologies where possible. The Commission’s established Demand-Side

Management (DSM) policy framework and the Standard Practice Manual provide a ready, meaningful template for the first utility VGI pilot projects and programs that will be examined in Phase 1. The Commission's experience with DSM programs and measures potentially provides a solid basis for shaping utility programs designed to meet policy objectives while building a new VGI utility program. This existing methodology can help the Commission organize and evaluate the information coming out of the early pilots and research and help inform the design of a cost-effective program for the future.

The pilot programs initiated in this proceeding will not be required to demonstrate positive cost-benefit ratios as a condition for approval. This proceeding will examine whether DSM and other proposed appropriate criteria should be applied to an on-going VGI program in the future should the outcome of the current pilots warrant continuation. Further, Phase 1 will outline an information inventory to be gathered in the course of pilot activities to be reported at the project's conclusion. Cost-benefit assessments will be important in determining whether pilot projects merit expansion or continuation on a programmatic basis as a utility service offering.

In addition, it is the Commission's responsibility to examine the public safety and health impact of utility programs for which we have oversight authority. The primary safety consideration for VGI program development will be its potential to enhance grid safety and reliability. In this context, it will also be important to explicitly identify the environmental and health benefits associated with vehicle grid integration.

3.1.4 Use Case Deployment

The ED White Paper describes a "V1G resource" as one where power flows only in one direction through the primary meter: from the grid to the

vehicle or facility where the vehicle is charging.¹¹ V1G resources face fewer implementation barriers than resources that can feed energy back onto the electric grid. To facilitate near-term implementation, Phase 1 will target “managed” or “incentivized” charging applications that do not involve battery discharge for resource purposes.¹² This will make it less likely that program participation will have an adverse impact on PEV drivers’ mobility or the life of participant vehicles.

An examination of existing protocols and rate design activities in other proceedings, such as, for Demand Response, Energy Efficiency and Distributed Self-Generation resource programs, will be included in Phase 1. This will provide an opportunity to identify possible candidate pilots to demonstrate AFV potential utilizing existing program design as well as coordinate this proceeding with other Commission electric vehicle activities.

The ED White Paper describes a sub-set of V1G use cases in which electricity may be discharged from the PEV battery, but where that electricity is used entirely on-site such that the PEV does not back-feed electricity onto the

¹¹ ED White Paper at 17.

¹² As defined in the White Paper, “Managed- (or alternatively Smart- or Controlled-) Charging” entails starting, stopping, or varying the unidirectional power flow into the battery with the objective of recharging the PEV “in coordination with time-of-use (TOU) pricing or the constraints of the system.” Incentivized Charging was not defined in the White Paper but was referenced in party comments as employing TOU rates or other incentives to encourage certain customer behaviors. Incentivized Charging is related to —but distinct from— Managed Charging since price incentives often are utilized in both cases. Incentivized Charging is achieved according to a customer’s economic behaviors according to a pre-defined pricing schedule, such as a utility tariff. In contrast, Managed Charging is achieved with the active dispatch of power flow according to a customer’s (or third party on the customer’s behalf) receipt of pricing or information of system constraints (e.g.: local distribution conditions, over-generation).

grid. Phase 1 will diverge slightly from the ED White Paper's discussion of V1G to include this "load modifier" strategy. The load modifier cases to be examined here are those where the amount of discharged PEV electricity never exceeds the customer's load.

Phase 1 will consider parties' comments and proposals addressing early implementation of these two types of resources: unidirectional power flow into the PEV battery and bidirectional power flow from the battery and the primary meter where the PEV is located, however, without backfeeding electricity onto the grid. From the grid's standpoint, these VGI cases both contemplate PEVs as resources that remain behind the customer's meter.

This proceeding will focus particularly on utility programs related to VGI. VGI services can also be delivered to the wholesale market. The Rule 24 proceeding (R.13-09-011) creates a clear set of rules allowing customers to directly access the wholesale market. Parties have not identified barriers to using Rule 24 wholesale market access that are unique to PEV resources. Therefore, we will not address VGI wholesale market access in this proceeding.

3.2 Phase I Scope: Statement of Issues

Accordingly, this Phase 1 will consider:

1. Should the Commission adopt the proposed AFV Guiding Principles? What modifications, if any, are appropriate?
2. Should the Commission consider an increased role for the utilities in PEV infrastructure deployment and, if so, what should that role be? If the Commission should consider utility ownership of PEV charging infrastructure, how should the Commission evaluate "underserved markets" or a "market failure" pursuant to D.11-07-029? What else should the Commission consider when evaluating an increased role for utilities in EV infrastructure deployment?

3. What education and outreach activities must the utilities provide to support further customer PEV adoption? What existing resources are available for these activities and what additional resources are needed?
4. How should the Commission mitigate the impact of demand charges, if at all, on entities pursuing transportation electrification?
5. How should the Commission identify and consider in this proceeding best practices achieved and lessons learned from current AFV pilot project results?
6. How should the Commission define an electric vehicle VGI resource generically? Which V1G use case initiatives should be considered as Demand-Side Management (DSM) measures? Are other regulatory program categories, such as energy storage and demand response, also applicable to particular utility AFV activities?
7. What are the transmission and distribution system grid safety, efficiency and reliability benefits of V1G use case applications? How can PEVs be used in order to capture these benefits?
8. How should the Commission define where a PEV resource connects to the grid? Should the PEV be defined as a stand-alone resource? When should PEVs be included as part of the charging host facility load?
9. Should the Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test and the Program Administrator Cost Test (PAC) found in the Standard Practices Manual¹³ be applied to electric vehicles programs? Do these tests need modification to account for any costs or benefits that are unique to electric vehicles? In particular, does the Standard Practice Manual adequately list the appropriate costs included in evaluating an electric vehicle VGI program? Does the definition of avoided cost benefits require modification to capture value unique to electric vehicles?

¹³ http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/ronlyres/004ABF9D-027C-4BE1-9AE1-CE56ADF8DADC/0/CPUC_STANDARD_PRACTICE_MANUAL.pdf

10. Should the Commission recognize the benefits associated with the following V1G impacts:
 - a. Reduction in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions;
 - b. Renewable Portfolio Standard Resource avoided cost;
 - c. ancillary services avoided cost;
 - d. decrease in gas consumption as fuel switching benefits; and
 - e. avoided environmental health costs.¹⁴
11. How should The Commission define the specific potential benefits of “incentivized charging” and “managed charging?” Are those benefits different if the VGI resource is from a single customer compared to an aggregated resource?
12. What utility V1G use case applications could be potential candidates for pilot project support?
13. What data and analysis should be required of VGI pilot projects for final results reporting by the utilities? What safety impact information should be required?

Some clarification of what will not be included within the scope for this proceeding is important. At this time, issues related to rates for Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicle refueling will not be addressed. The overwhelming interest expressed in this proceeding has been for consideration of PEV-related issues.

In addition, review or development of PEV rates for the residential sector is not within scope of this proceeding. First, the utilities already have authority to develop residential rates for PEV customers and, indeed, each utility has a PEV charging rate for residential customers in place. Second, the outcome of the

¹⁴ See D.10-12-024, 2010 Demand, Response Cost-effectiveness Protocols, Appendix 1, Section 3, Costs and Benefits of Demand Response.

currently ongoing residential rate design proceeding Rulemaking (R.) 12-06-013, may have a significant impact on any incentives via rates for residential customers. It is prudent to wait for a decision in that proceeding before taking on any additional reform of PEV rates for residential customers here.

The only exception will be the issue of whether residential PEV customers should continue to be exempted from line extension upgrade costs. This issue will be addressed in Phase 2 after the workshop discussing the latest IOU Load Research Report to be held after December 2014, as directed in D.13-06-014.

4. Procedural Structure for Phase I:

Phase 1 will be resolved in two interim decisions. The first decision will adopt Guiding Principles (Section 3.2, Question 1) and resolve the Current Program Issues (Section 3.2, Questions 2 through 5). The record underlying the first interim decision will be developed through Comments and Reply Comments as set forth in the schedule below. Opening and Reply Comments addressing the proposed Guiding Principles, Section 3.2, Question 1 and the Section 3.2, Questions 2 through 5 are due on the dates set forth in the schedule below.

The second interim decision will resolve the remaining issues included in the scope for VGI Program development (Section 3.2, Questions 6 through 13.) The record underlying the second interim decision will be developed in workshops and further comments. ED will notice and conduct a workshop addressing potential VGI program benefits and costs policy and another workshop to be defined by future ruling or notice. A tentative schedule and procedural structure for these activities are set forth below. The assigned ALJ will issue a ruling outlining the schedule and final agenda closer to the dates designated for these activities.

5. Phases 2 and 3 - VGI Resource Expanded Development:

In Phase 2, the Commission will continue to answer the questions posed in the ED White Paper regarding regulatory barriers (other than demand charges considered in Phase 1), defining the vehicle resource, the utility's role in aggregation, capturing grid benefits and further refining VGI services priorities. The Commission will also seek to better understand the value of various VGI applications, taking into account charging levels, battery capacity and resource flexibility. In addition, the rulemaking will continue to examine the evolving rules and regulations for demand response and energy storage. Consideration of V2G applications that back-feed electricity beyond the primary utility meter, including "battery second life," will be discussed in Phase 2 of this proceeding.

Finally, while parties suggested that the Commission take into consideration policies for the dual promotion of PEVs with renewable energy and EVs as forms of energy storage, those issues will not be included. That said, any evaluation of VGI value conducted in this proceeding will consider the coupling of PEVs with solar PV and/or stand-alone storage systems.

A separate amended scoping memo and ruling will be issued following the close of Phase 1 to address VGI Use Cases 1-4 policy not addressed or fully examined in Phase 1 and further guidance on market acceleration issues as needed. One key element of Phase 2 will be the further coordination and integration of the Commission's new PEV programs with the work undertaken in the DR and storage proceedings. Following Phase 2, we anticipate initiating Phase 3 to address rate and cost allocation issues for priority sectors, VGI use case 4 programs or pilots and development of program design and implementation guidance for new VGI Use Cases 1, 2 and 3 tariffed utility services.

6. Schedule and Need for Hearings

The table below provides a schedule for the proceeding.

EVENT	DATES
Rulemaking Issued	November 22, 2013
1st Round Comments	December 13, 2013
1st Round Reply Comments	December 20, 2013
VGI Workshop held	December 4, 2013
Post-Workshop Comments	February 9, 2014
PHC	February 26, 2014
ACR Scoping Ruling and Memo Issued	July, 2014
Phase 1 Comments on proposed Guiding Principles and Current Program Issues to be filed and served.	August 29, 2014
Phase 1 Reply Comments on proposed Guiding Principles and Current Program Issues to be filed and served.	September 12, 2014
Interim PD on Guiding Principles and Current Program Issues target date	November 21, 2014
Phase I VGI first workshop Notice and Agenda served.	September, 2014
Phase 1, 1 st VGI Workshop	October, 2014
Post-Workshop Comments to be filed and served.	October, 2014
Post-Workshop Replies to be filed and served.	October, 2014
Phase 1, 2 nd VGI Workshop	January, 2015
Interim PD on VGI Issues target date	April, 2015
Amended Scoping Memo issued: Phase II and III	April, 2015
Final Decision targeted	Late 2015/early, 2016

If so required, the assigned ALJ may alter this schedule as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the proceeding. Consistent with Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5, the Commission anticipates that this proceeding will be completed within 18 months of the date of the issuance of this Scoping Ruling.

7. Proceeding Category and *Ex Parte* Rules

The Commission preliminarily categorized this as a quasi-legislative proceeding and for which no hearings are necessary. The parties did not oppose the Commission's preliminary categorization. This ruling affirms the preliminary categorization of quasi-legislative. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4, *ex parte* communications are permitted without any restrictions.

8. Presiding Officer

Pursuant to Rule 13.2 (c), assigned Commissioner Carla J. Peterman is the Presiding Officer in this proceeding and Irene K. Moosen is the assigned ALJ.

9. Filing, Service, and Service List

When filing and/or serving documents in this proceeding, all Parties are reminded to review the most current Commission Rules of Practice and Procedures to comply with the latest rules in effect. Prepared testimony is to be served, but not filed, pursuant to Rule 13.8(a). The Docket Card provides electronic access to filed documents included in the official record, as well as all Rulings and Decisions.

Parties are encouraged to file electronically, whenever possible, as it speeds processing of the filings and allows them to be posted on the Commission's website. More information about electronic filing is available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/efiling>. This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocols adopted by the Commission in Rules 1.10 and 1.13 for all documents, whether formally filed or just served. These Rules provide for

electronic service of documents, in a searchable format, unless the appearance or state service list member did not provide an e-mail address. If no e-mail address was provided, service should be made by U.S. mail. Concurrent e-mail service to ALL persons on the service list for whom an e-mail address is available, including those listed under “Information Only,” is required. Parties are expected to provide paper copies of served documents upon request.

Any e-mail communication about this proceeding should include, at a minimum, the following information on the subject line of the e-mail:

R.13-11-007 AFV Rulemaking. In addition, the party sending the e-mail should briefly describe the attached communication; for example, Brief. Paper format copies, in addition to electronic copies, shall be served on the assigned Commissioner and the ALJ.

The official service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission’s website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list is correct, and serve notice of any errors on the Commission’s Process Office, the service list, and the ALJ. Prior to serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the most up-to-date service list. The list on the Commission’s website meets that definition.

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission’s procedures or who has questions about the electronic filing procedures should contact the Commission’s Public Advisor at (866) 849-8390 or (415) 703-2074, or (866) 836-7825 (TTY-toll free), or send an e-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

10. Intervenor Compensation

Those Parties found eligible in a Ruling on a timely-filed Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation may submit Requests for Claims for

Intervenor Compensation after the Commission issues its final Decision on Phase I issues and again in separate claims that cover Phase II and Phase III participation after the final Decision on Phase II and Phase III issues in this proceeding.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated July 16, 2014, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CARLA J. PETERMAN

Carla J. Peterman
Assigned Commissioner